UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANDREW MCINTOSH, Individually and On :

Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-00889-LDW-ETB

Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Plaintiff,

CLASS ACTION

VS.

VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al.,

BARRY LINZER, On Behalf of Himself and

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-00957-DRH-ETB

All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

CLASS ACTION

CLASS ACTION

VS.

VS.

VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

BRUCE KANTOR, On Behalf of Himself and:

All Others Similarly Situated,

Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-00967-LDW-ETB

. . . .

Plaintiff,

VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

3

[Caption continued on following page.]

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF NECA-IBEW PENSION FUND'S (THE DECATUR PLAN) MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT AS LEAD PLAINTIFF AND FOR APPROVAL OF LEAD PLAINTIFF'S CHOICE OF LEAD COUNSEL

GEORGE F. WALKER, Individually and On Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-01003-JS-ETB Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, **CLASS ACTION** Plaintiff, VS. VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al., Defendants. PHILIP G. COLLINS, On Behalf of Himself Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-01277-LDW-ETB and All Others Similarly Situated, **CLASS ACTION** Plaintiff. VS. VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al., Defendants. SERVAAS HOLTHUIZEN, Individually and Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-01337-LDW-ETB On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, **CLASS ACTION** Plaintiff, vs. VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al., Defendants. GERALD J. VOGT, et al., On Behalf of Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-01430-LDW-ETB Themselves and All Others Similarly Situated, **CLASS ACTION** Plaintiffs, VS. VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al., Defendants. X [Caption continued on following page.]

	X
TIMOTHY JOE GROVE, On Behalf of Himself and All Others Similarly Situated, Plaintiff,	: Civil Action No. 2:05-CV-01552-LDW-ETB : CLASS ACTION :
vs.	: : :
VEECO INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al.,	:
Defendants.	: :
	X

I. INTRODUCTION

NECA-IBEW Pension Fund (The Decatur Plan) ("NECA") respectfully submits this memorandum in further support of its motion to be appointed as lead plaintiff and for approval of NECA's choice of Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP as lead counsel. Two movants filed oppositions to NECA's motion for appointment as lead plaintiff, the Steelworkers Pension Trust ("Steelworkers Trust"), and Ratan LalChandani. As demonstrated in the Opposition of NECA-IBEW Pension Fund (The Decatur Plan) to Competing Motions to Appoint Lead Plaintiff and to Approve Lead Plaintiff's Choice of Lead Counsel ("NECA's Oppo."), filed on May 5, 2005, neither the Steelworkers Trust nor Ratan LalChandani can be appointed as lead plaintiff. In addition, as demonstrated in NECA's Oppo., the arguments asserted by the Steelworkers Trust and Ratan LalChandani do not prevent the appointment of NECA as lead plaintiff in this case.

II. ARGUMENT

The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PSLRA") requires that the Court appoint as lead plaintiff the movant that has the largest financial interest in the litigation, and that also satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(I). Although both the Steelworkers Trust and Ratan LalChandani claim to have larger financial interests in the litigation, neither satisfies Rule 23, and therefore they cannot be appointed as lead plaintiff. *See* NECA's Oppo. at 4-7; *See* 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(II) (movant cannot be appointed as lead plaintiff if it "will not fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class; or is subject to unique defenses that render such plaintiff incapable of adequately representing the class"). ¹

The Steelworkers Trust has conceded that it is unwilling to represent the interests of the entire class. *See* NECA's Oppo. at 4-7. *See also Borenstein v. Finova Group*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14732, at *26-27 (D. Ariz. Aug. 28,2000) (holding that appointing a proposed lead plaintiff

that had emphatically argued against the claims of a large subclass "would pose a significant risk that the complete interests of all class members would not be fairly and adequately protected"). Ratan LalChandani (and Joel Mandel) cannot adequately represent the interests of the class because, as individuals, they have not demonstrated that they are able to meet the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Malasky v. IAC/InteractiveCorp*, 04 Civ. 7447 (RJH), 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25832, at *9 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2005) (expressing concern that individual with the largest financial interest could not meet Rule 23's adequacy requirement because he was not an institutional investor, and appointing an institutional investor with him).

NECA, on the other hand, is precisely the type of institutional investor Congress intended would lead securities actions like this one. See Schulman v. Lumenis, Ltd., No. 02 Civ. 1989 (DAB), 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10348, at *10 (S.D.N.Y. June 17, 2003) (holding that institutional investors are in the best position to prosecute securities fraud claims and to negotiate with and supervise counsel); IAC, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25832, at *9 (appointing institution as lead plaintiff even though it did not have the largest financial interest).² Although the Steelworkers Trust attempts to disqualify NECA based upon the unremarkable fact that NECA sold all of its shares in Veeco prior to the end of the Class Period, such a fact does not prevent NECA from appointment as lead plaintiff. See NECA's Oppo. at 8-15. As already demonstrated by NECA in its opposition, in and out traders are sure to exist in any class, and especially in a case such as this where there is a partial disclosure during the class period. Id. In addition, even if a defense is raised against in and out traders, it will not be unique to NECA since there are likely to be hundreds of in and out traders in this case given the enormity of the volume of shares traded after the announcement. Id. at 11-15. For these reasons, NECA is not subject to unique defenses, and as the only institutional movant that has been forthright with the Court and that has not abandoned large subclasses of purchasers, it

should be appointed as lead plaintiff in this case. *See* NECA's Oppo.; *IAC*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25832, at *11-13; *Schulman*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10348, at *10.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and for the reasons set forth in NECA's Oppo. and NECA's opening motion and memorandum in support thereof, NECA respectfully requests that the Court appoint it as lead plaintiff and approve its choice of Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP as lead counsel.

DATED: May 12, 2005

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP SAMUEL H. RUDMAN (SR-7957) DAVID A. ROSENFELD (DR-7564) MARIO ALBA, JR. (MA-7240)

/s/ Mario Alba, Jr.
MARIO ALBA, JR.

200 Broadhollow Road, Suite 406 Melville, NY 11747 Telephone: 631/367-7100 631/367-1173 (fax)

[Proposed] Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Mario Alba, Jr., hereby certify that on May 12, 2005, I caused a true and correct copy of the attached:

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF NECA-IBEW PENSION FUND'S (THE DECATUR PLAN) MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT AS LEAD PLAINTIFF AND TO APPROVE LEAD PLAINTIFF'S CHOICE OF LEAD COUNSEL

to be served: (i) electronically on all counsel registered for electronic service for this case; and (ii) by first-class mail to all additional counsel on the attached service list.

/s/ Mario Alba, Jr.
Mario Alba, Jr.

VEECO INSTRUMENTS (EDNY) Service List - 4/18/2005 (05-0043) Page 1 of 3

Counsel For Defendant(s)

Robert F. Serio Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 200 Park Avenue, 47th Floor New York, NY 10166-0193 212/351-4000 212/351-4035(Fax)

Counsel For Plaintiff(s)

Mark C. Gardy Abbey Gardy, LLP 212 East 39th Street New York, NY 10016 212/889-3700 212/684-5191 (Fax)

Steven J. Toll
Daniel S. Sommers
Julie Goldsmith Reiser
Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld & Toll, P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005-3964
202/408-4600
202/408-4699(Fax)

Alfred G. Yates, Jr.
Law Offices of Alfred G. Yates, Jr., P.C.
519 Allegheny Building
429 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
412/391-5164
412/471-1033(Fax)

Evan J. Smith Marc L. Ackerman Brodsky & Smith, LLC 240 Mineola Blvd., 1st Floor Mineola, NY 11501 516/741-4977 610/667-9029(Fax)

Catherine A. Torell
Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld & Toll, P.L.L.C.
150 East 52nd Street, 13th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212/838-7797
212/838-7745(Fax)

Brian M. Felgoise Law Offices of Brian M. Felgoise, P.C. 261 Old York Road, Suite 423 Jenkintown, PA 19046 215/886-1900 215/886-1909(Fax)

VEECO INSTRUMENTS (EDNY) Service List - 4/18/2005 (05-0043)

Page 2 of 3

Charles J. Piven
Law Offices of Charles J. Piven, P.A.
The World Trade Center-Baltimore
401 East Pratt Street, Suite 2525
Baltimore, MD 21202
410/332-0030
410/685-1300(Fax)

Marc S. Henzel Law Offices of Marc S. Henzel 273 Montgomery Avenue, Suite 202 Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004 610/660-8000 610/660-8080(Fax)

Steven G. Schulman
Peter E. Seidman
Milberg Weiss Bershad & Schulman LLP
One Pennsylvania Plaza
New York, NY 10119
212/594-5300
212/868-1229(Fax)

Jules Brody
Aaron Brody
Tzivia Brody
Stull, Stull & Brody
6 East 45th Street, 4th Floor
New York, NY 10017
212/687-7230
212/490-2022(Fax)

Curtis V. Trinko Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko LLP 16 West 46th Street, Seventh Floor New York, NY 10036 212/490-9550 212/986-0158(Fax)

Samuel H. Rudman
David A. Rosenfeld
Mario Alba, Jr.
Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman &
Robbins LLP
200 Broadhollow Road, Suite 406
Melville, NY 11747
631/367-7100
631/367-1173(Fax)

Marc A. Topaz Richard A. Maniskas Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP 280 King of Prussia Road Radnor, PA 19087 610/667-7706 610/667-7056(Fax)

Joseph H. Weiss Weiss & Lurie 551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600 New York, NY 10176 212/682-3025 212/682-3010(Fax) VEECO INSTRUMENTS (EDNY)

Service List - 4/18/2005 (05-0043)

Page 3 of 3

Fred T. Isquith
Christopher S. Hinton
Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz, LLP
270 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016
212/545-4600
212/545-4653(Fax)